"Statement Analysis of Melissa Gusé's October 13, 2018, Facebook Live Video-Part 2", *Finding Truth In The Lie* on YouTube, 2019.05.30, a transcript by ./SYNOPŦEX, 2023.07.03~2025.06.22-12:03.

Original publication: youtube.com

Archived version: archive.org

Statement Analysis of

Melissa Gusé's October 13, 2018, Facebook Live Video-Part 2, a transcript

CONTENTS

Description....2
Transcript....2
Sentences 6, 7....2
Sentences 8, 9, 10....3
Sentence 11....3
Sentences 12, 13....4
Sentence 14....5
Sentence 15....7
Sentences 16, 17, 18, 19....7
Sentence 20....8
Sentence 21....8
Sentences 22-24....9
Sentence 25....10
Sentence 26....10
Sentence 27....10
Sentences 28, 29....11
Sentence 30....11
Sentences 31, 32, 33....11

Description

• This is Part 2 of Melissa Gusé's October 13, 2018, Facebook Live Video Statement

• The first 10 minutes of Part 1* covers some basic Statement Analysis principles and is helpful in understanding the analysis

• It is recommended that you watch Part 1 before watching Part 2

Transcript

00.00 Welcome back as we continue on with Melissa Gusé's October 13, 2018 Facebook Live video statement.

Sentences 6, 7

> We're coming up on 10 hours, and now's the part where I'm saying I have to do something because we've had CHP fly over, we've had the, Inyo County, Inyo Mono County Sher-, uh Sheriffs flying over, er, ah. Bishop PD, CHP flying over … they had their copter today.

When Melissa says ‹coming up›, she's not saying ⸗~~she's been missing for 10 hours~~⸗; ‹coming up› spans time and allows for her to skip crucial information leading ‹up› to this point. And in ‹10 hours› we note the reference to time. And she says, ‹now's the part where I'm saying I have to do something›. The ‹part› is a reference to a moment of time. Actors have and play "parts" in a fictionalized story as well. ‹10 hours› has passed since Karlie went 01.00 missing, ‹and now is› her ‹part›.

«Now's» ‹the part where I'm saying I have to do something›. Melissa did not say: ⸗~~I have to do something~~⸗, in the form of a statement. Rather, Melissa stated that she was making a statement. This statement shows that Melissa is aware of her audience and most likely the statement was made for their benefit. The difference is this: "I'm saying I have to send help", – versus, – "I am sending help".

«Now's» ‹the part where I'm saying I have to do something›. Typically "have to" is equivalent to "doesn't want to".

«Now's» ‹the part where I'm saying I have to do something›, – not, – ⸗~~now's the part where Karlie needs your help~~⸗, – or, – ⸗~~we need your help finding Karlie~~⸗. The ‹something› Melissa «has» ‹to do› is undefined. Now the undefined ‹something› is ‹because›, and that's a word that indicates sensitivity.

> we've had CHP fly over, we've had the, Inyo County, Inyo Mono County Sher-, uh Sheriffs 02.00 flying over, er, ah. Bishop PD,

* Video: youtube.com · archive.org; transcript: odysee.com · archive.org.

We didn't have to wait long for an answer as to why after ‹10 hours› Melissa «has» ‹to do something›. ⌜Law enforcement is involved⌟ and ‹now› she «has» ‹to do something›. Her child is missing and now she's only *saying* she «has» ‹to do something› – ‹now's the part›.

When she used the word ‹because› – if we go back to the beginning of this video – when someone makes a statement, and they have a *need to explain* something *without being asked*, it is sensitive to the subject. And ⌜law enforcement involvement⌟ has brought sensitivity into Melissa's statement.

> we've had CHP fly over and we've had the Inyo County, Inyo Mono County

And here Melissa uses pronoun ‹we› to unify herself with law enforcement.

Sentences 8, 9, 10

> Thank you to CHP - love you. And, um, we are going to potentially have the helicopter do the search over a very large area Chalfant, all the 03.00way around us, all the way down to, like, Laws. And they're amazing, and, um, several Mono County Sheriffs and….

Melissa is heaping high praise onto law enforcement. And in statement analysis, we recognize what's called the *ingratiating factor* in language. This is where a subject ingratiates himself to the recipient, – and right here, it's law enforcement – often using flattery and attempt to be on their side or the side of police or the authorities. The flattery or ingratiating words indicate the opposite. Here we see Melissa linguistically ingratiating herself to the good guys, the officials, which highlights her need to be seen as a good guy. She is exposing her own need to be seen in a positive light. This is the ingratiating factor in analysis. Melissa is praising the police for not finding Karlie.

Innocent parents of missing children 04.00will not ingratiate themselves to the police. They will voice anger and frustration that their child has not been found. It isn't until much later, months or years, when acceptance has settled in, they may thank police for searching. Melissa saying ‹Thank you›, ‹love you›, and ‹they're amazing› in regards to the people that have not found Karlie is unexpected.

She ends her sentence with ‹and› without completing the thought, so that does indicate that she's self censored and that there is missing information.

Sentence 11

> I see all your faces popping up and it makes me want to cry. I love you guys!

Melissa has interrupted her message to directly engage her audience. When she says ‹it makes me want to cry›, "want" is defined as to have a desire to do something and seeing all of her Facebook friends compels her to have a desire ‹to cry›. She is not say-

ing that she feels like crying, just that she «wants» 05.00to cry. And when she says, ‹I love you guys›, that is more ingratiation. This time it's directed at her intended Facebook audience.

Sentences 12, 13

> And I'm putting this out there because, um, it's going on 10 hours that she's been missing. And I want to put this on blast because I don't think she's out in the desert.

There is a lot of information in these two sentences. She starts her sentence with ‹And›, and that always indicates that there is missing information and that it is linguistically tied to the previous sentence.

‹And I'm putting this out there because›. And the ‹because› indicates a need to explain why or a need to persuade without being asked. And this is flagged as sensitive. She then follows this with an ‹um›, which is slowing down her thought process. And that is followed by ‹it's going on 10 hours›. And that is a phrase that spans time. With this phrasing, Melissa is able 06.00to bridge time and possibly withhold critical information without directly lying. Phrases that span time indicate missing information.

Following this, she gives another sensitivity indicator explaining why, which is ‹that›. So after this second sensitivity indicator, she moves into, ‹she's been missing›. And this is in the passive voice. And passive voice serves to distance themselves from the topic discussed. And it may also serve to conceal identity or responsibility for the action. This statement is unreliable at this point, and we'll see where she takes us.

She starts her second sentence again with an ‹And›, which indicates missing information, and she repeats herself, ‹I want to put this on blast›. In her previous sentence, she had said, ‹I'm putting this out there›. So the ‹putting this› is repetitive. She's not saying what she said in her first sentence. Her first sentence was stronger, because «I am» is 07.00stronger than ‹I want to›. So her second sentence is very weak. The ‹I want to› is weaker. And she moves into a third sensitivity indicator ‹because›. In these two sentences, there's now three sensitivity indicators. And this makes this extremely sensitive to her. She's about to explain why, in relation to the amount of time Karlie has been missing, and Karlie's location, that she wants ‹to put this on blast›. In this heavy cluster of blues, we are likely to find deception. Crimes are solved within the cluster of blues.

Immediately after her third sensitivity indicator, she moves into a negation, ‹I don't think she's out in the desert›. Melissa uses spontaneous negation in her open statement. She is telling us what she «doesn't think», which on its own is deceptive. She is thinking this because she's stated as much. It is not expected for a subject to report what they don't think, believe, 08.00don't hear, don't see, etc. The negation indicates what follows is sensitive to the speaker – ‹she's out in the desert›. Karlie being ‹out in the desert› is in her thoughts, and this may be leakage about Karlie's

location. This is a very concerning statement. ‹I don't think› is a weak assertion and she is allowing for others to think otherwise.

Law enforcement has been searching for Karlie with helicopters and Karlie has been missing for ‹10 hours›. The area where Karlie went ‹missing› is surrounded by ‹desert›.

This begs the question, does Melissa have knowledge otherwise?

‹I don't think she's out in the desert›. Note that it is ‹the desert› rather than ⸗~~a desert~~⸗. Oops, remember talking about articles? First comes the introduction with the word "a desert" and then comes the article "the" after recognition. Articles do not lie; ‹the desert› indicates she knows where Carly is. The cluster of blues indicate deception and Melissa is [09.00]deceptively withholding knowledge of Karlie's whereabouts.

This reminds me of a very similar statement, made by Cindy Anthony: ‹George and I don't believe Caylee is in the woods or anything›. Caylee Anthony was found in the woods a block away from there. This is an example of leakage. That is, even while being deceptive, people may just leak out information they did not intend to share, simply because it weighs so heavily on the mind.

Sentence 14

> I think that she could've been abducted or taken because we do live by a highway, and, it happens and I'm bein' real.

Melissa now offers a hypothesis as to what may have happened to Karlie. She «thinks» – which is a weak assertion allowing others to think otherwise – ‹that› – is highlighted in blue as it gives a linguistic cue she's about to explain why she «thinks».

She uses the conditional words ‹could've been abducted or taken›. [10.00]And this is stated using the passive voice, which shows a need to conceal identity or responsibility for the «abduction» ‹or› «taking» of Karlie. If she doesn't know the «abductor» or «taker», this is appropriate language and will stand on its own without any need of explanation or sensitivity indicators. Yet there are two sensitivity indicators in her sentence. Melissa uses the term ‹abducted›, which is a conclusion that is reached after evidence indicates such.

What leads Melissa to believe that Karlie has been abducted?

She then softens her language and gives another possibility: ‹or taken›. She indicates no outrage at this possibility. She does not say, ⸗~~that animal that took my daughter~~⸗, or ⸗~~that disgusting, sick POS that took my daughter~~⸗. «Taken» is very soft and passive. This is now front and center of all things: ⸢⸢Carly has been taken, meaning that someone has her, she is alive, and she must be returned⸣⸣. The language should not change to accept [11.00]anything less than this notion of «abduction», or «taking». Our expectation for a ‹taken› child is for the parents to verbalize concern for what the child is experiencing, to beg the kidnapper to care for the child, and to beg the kidnapper to return her. Melissa is unable, or unwilling, to call out to Karlie's «abductors». She is also unable, or

unwilling, to condemn the «abductor» or «taker» of Karlie. The passivity, the soft minimizing language, and the disposition towards the abductor or taker indicates both deception and responsibility.

The context is vital. The child is missing and the expectation is that the parent or caretaker will show a majority of the language, the priority being with what the child is going through currently. This is something that can drive a parent crazy with worry. It's all about the child. Our expectation is to hear Melissa say something along the lines of, ~~≠Someone kidnapped my stepdaughter and she~~ [12.00]~~needs her medicine≠~~, or fill in the blank. This expresses through words a positive linguistic disposition towards the victim. It is expected. Its absence is for a reason. Melissa is building a narrative or telling a story rather than reporting what happened. Leaving the possibility open to both «abduction» ‹or› «taking», coupled with ‹I think›, makes her assertion weak and allows her to be vague.

We also note the change in language from ‹missing› to ‹abducted›, to ‹taken›, and later in her statement, back to ‹missing›. There is no change in reality to justify this change in language.

What makes Melissa believe that Karlie ‹could've been abducted or taken›?

We don't have to wait long for her answer. She begins her reasons why Karlie ‹could've been abducted or taken› with the word ‹because›, which is a sensitivity indicator. And the first reason she gives is ‹we do live by a highway›. And ‹do› is an additional unneeded word. And she put that in there to add emphasis where it is not [13.00]needed. And this is a *need to persuade*.

The second reason she gives is ‹it happens›. And ‹it› is a depersonalizing way to refer to her daughter being ‹abducted or taken›. Even though this is her attempt at persuasion, "it happens" is your car getting ran into by a cart in a shopping center. It's not how you would refer to your daughter being ‹abducted or taken›. We need to consider also that ‹it› may be something else entirely. She may be speaking about something else at this point. And ‹it happens› sounds a lot like "shit happens", which is very unexpected.

All of these reasons sound very negative linguistically towards the victim. This is pessimistic after ‹10 hours› of missing status. This has an undertone of subtle victim blaming as well, as if whatever Karlie encountered ‹happens› and it's her fault.

The third [14.00]reason that Melissa believes Karlie ‹could have been abducted or taken› is ‹I'm being real›. And this has the same meaning or connotation as "I'm being honest." We are now wondering when hasn't she been ‹real› or ‹honest›. And in statement analysis, this is one of those phrases that puts you on alert for dishonesty.

After those reasons Melissa gave to persuade that Karlie ‹could have been abducted or taken›, one is left to wonder who has a need to persuade that their daughter has ‹been abducted or taken›. And the answer: someone who may know their daughter hasn't ‹been abducted or taken›.

Sentence 15

> And, I just want to let everybody know.

Melissa starts her sentence with ‹And›, which always indicates missing information, and then she says ‹I just›. The word ‹just› is a unique one in statement analysis. Let's talk about the word "just", because it's important to this statement, and even more important to Melissa's October 22, [15.00]2018 statement. The word "just" is a familiar one to traffic cops.

– "How many drinks have you had?"

– "*Just* two, officer."

The word "just" is employed because the driver is comparing the number "two" with a greater figure. When one answers "just two, officer," it is done by the brain signaling the tongue in less than a microsecond, which words to use. When a mind is thinking of a higher number, the brain signals this fact by sending the message to the tongue to utilize the word "just" in language. The brain quickly scans its list of vocabulary and produces "just" without debate or pre-thought. For the officer, this is a signal that the subject is thinking of more than "two" drinks. It may be that the subject actually had six drinks, and when he went to lie, the brain leaked out, in less than a microsecond, the word "just." The takeaway message is this. The word "just" is used when comparing something to a greater amount, or a greater thought, or a greater action. The purpose of the use of the word "just" is to minimize or reduce.

So back to Melissa's [16.00]statement: ‹I just want to let everybody know›. Why then is Melissa wanting to minimize her announcement that Karlie is ‹missing›? It is most likely that Melissa has a bigger motivation in mind with the making of her video. The question is, what's a bigger ‹want› than «letting» ‹everybody know›? And the answer very well may be having everyone believe what she is saying. She ‹just› «wants» ‹to let everybody know› that Karlie ‹could have been abducted or taken›. Not, ~~⸗I want everybody to help find Karlie⸗~~. Not, ~~⸗I hope Karlie is safe in the hands of her abductors⸗~~. Not, ~~⸗help bring her home⸗~~. She is not asking for help for Karlie. She is only *informing* her audience of her narrative. There is no call to action.

Sentences 16, 17, 18, 19

> Alicia, you're calling me? Are you watching the video? She's not watching the video. That's okay.

Melissa breaks away from her "Karlie is missing" announcement to engage her audience directly. ‹That's okay›, – not, – ~~⸗you need to watch⸗~~. [17.00]⌜‹That's okay› that an audience member doesn't watch and therefore know that her daughter is missing⌟. She has now used Alicia's name the same number of times as she's used Karlie's.

Sentence 20

> I want to put this on blast because I don't know what to do to consider her a missing person.

‹I want to› is not ⸗~~I am putting~~⸗ ‹this on blast›. There is a big difference between "I am" and "I want to". When Melissa says ‹I want to›, she is slowing down the pace of her statement. ‹I want to› qualifies what she does and brings in motive. She moves into the sensitivity indicator ‹because› signaling she's about to give the reason why without being asked.

She is sensitive to ‹I don't know what to do to consider her a missing person›. This is reported in the negative, making it doubly sensitive. We look to what follows the negation to find where her sensitivity is, and it's ‹what to do to consider her a missing person›. "Consider" is defined as to think of or believe something to be a certain way: [18.00]‹I don't know what to do to› ⌜think of Karlie as⌟ ‹a missing person›.

Why is she having difficulty believing or thinking Karlie as ‹a missing person›?

She has called in law enforcement. Law enforcement is searching. She's been searching. She's making this Facebook live video to report Karlie missing to her audience. She's not indicating she's having difficulty coming to terms with Karlie's missing status. She is indicating that she doesn't ‹know what to do to› think or believe ‹her a missing person›. She is speaking to *believing her own story*.

She now refers to Karlie as ‹a missing person›. Karlie has been relegated to a ‹person› who is ‹missing›, not her ⸗~~stepdaughter~~⸗, not ⸗~~Karlie~~⸗. She is ‹a› ‹person› who's ‹missing› among many people who are missing. This is extreme psychological distancing. We continue to wait for Melissa to use Karlie's name, introduce her and indicate ownership in their relationship. She is no longer ‹abducted or taken›. She is ‹missing›. There is no change in reality to justify [19.00]the change in language. Melissa is deceptive in this statement. She ponders aloud how to believe what she is saying. Her language changes with no justification. Melissa would not pass a polygraph if questioned using her own language.

Sentence 21

> Um, you can't do an Amber Alert because she didn't leave in a car, and I don't have a physical description of a vehicle.

Melissa starts her sentence with um, which indicates she is slowing down her thoughts. She then moves into ‹you›, which is a *universal you*, indicating distance, which is inappropriate considering this is her stepdaughter who is ‹missing›. This is not a universal experience. It's a highly personal, hormonally loaded experience, and we expect the emergence of ⸗~~I~~⸗. As this is highly personal, this should bring maternal instinct to the surface.

She then moves into a negation, ‹you can't›, which indicates what follows is sensitive to the subject. Melissa is sensitive to ‹an Amber Alert› [20.00]for Karlie. This is immedi-

ately followed by another sensitivity indicator, ‹because›, which gives a reason why without asking. This is followed by another negation, ‹didn't›, and another sensitivity indicator, leave, which indicates critically withheld information. Melissa is very sensitive to Karlie «leaving» ‹in a car›. Her mind is stuck back at the point when ‹she didn't leave in a car›.

She then moves into another negation, ‹don't›, with sensitivity about «having» ‹a physical description of a vehicle›. Did you notice the change in language from ‹car› to ‹vehicle›? It is important to note when a person's personal dictionary changes, people don't change their language arbitrarily. People use very specific words and are consistent with their language as long as their relationship or experience with the item or person remains the same. A change in language is expected when the relationship or experience with the item or person changes. The change of language from ‹car› to ‹vehicle› at this point in the story tells us that the subject [21.00]viewed what Karlie ‹didn't leave in› differently than from ‹a description› that Melissa «doesn't» ‹have›. The relationship did change in Melissa's statement. «Vehicle» is a term more commonly used by law enforcement, mechanics, and insurance adjusters. The common term is ‹car›, not ‹vehicle›. When Melissa associates with what Karlie ‹didn't leave in›, it is ‹a car›. When Melissa associates with what she «doesn't» ‹have a description of›, it is ‹a vehicle›. Melissa wants to distinguish between the two things. Melissa is distancing herself with the use of the word ‹vehicle›.

Earlier in her statement, Melissa stated that ‹she could've been abducted or taken›. One would assume that Melissa did not witness the «abduction» or «taking» of Karlie and thus have a physical description of a vehicle. This was to state what did not need to be stated. Yet, Melissa asserts that Karlie ‹didn't leave in a car›. This one sentence is overwhelmingly deceptive and indicates that Melissa has guilty knowledge of and is deceptively withholding how Karlie «left» the house that morning.

Sentences 22-24

> [22.00]She is 5 foot 7 … hold on … let's do this good … wait, there she is. She's 5 foot 7, about 115 pounds. She has blue eyes and the cutest little nose and a great smile and her hair goes all the way down past her, like, to her belly, let's say, mid-waist.

Melissa wants to create a partnership with her audience, as evidenced by her use of the word, ‹let's›, which is a form of ingratiation. She is also indicating she doesn't want to be alone with this. When she says, ‹there she is›, she is subtly distancing herself from Karlie. One wonders with the flattering physical characteristics, such as ‹cutest little nose and a great smile›, Melissa attributes to the stepdaughter, whom she won't name, if she has a desperate need to announce to her Facebook audience that while her daughter is missing, she is an attentive and great stepmother.

Sentence 25

> And this was last year's picture, so she, she's a little bit different, but not much she's still like adorably cute.

[23.00]Melissa starts her sentence with ‹And›, which indicates missing information. «This» indicates closeness. When she says ‹this was last year's picture›, she is willing to indicate closeness to Karlie's ‹picture› physically. She is unwilling to indicate closeness to the Karlie in the picture as evidenced by ‹there she is› in her previous sentences.

She then states ‹this was last year's picture›, not ‹this› ~~‹is›~~ ‹last year's picture›. The ‹picture› was taken ‹last year›. However, she is currently holding it up for her audience to see. She didn't say ≠this picture was taken last year≠. She is saying ‹this was last year's picture›. Past tense reference noted. The rest of her verbs in the sentence are present tense. This is a red flag that Melissa has belief or knowledge that Karlie is deceased.

She moves [24.00]into a sensitivity indicator ‹so›, which is a need to explain why. Melissa then stutters on ‹she›, which indicates increased anxiety when referencing how Karlie currently looks. Stuttering on pronouns in a non-stutterer is significant. Speaking of Karlie's current appearance has caused her brain to hiccup on ‹she›. Melissa does not explain how Karlie is ‹a little bit different›, which causes one to wonder what is it about Karlie's current appearance that is causing Melissa to explain, stutter, and qualify ‹different› as ‹a little bit›. Please consider that Karlie's appearance was more than ‹a little bit different› the last time Melissa saw her.

She then refutes or minimizes what she just stated about Karlie's appearance being ‹a little bit different› with ‹but›. She offers negation with ‹not›, so what follows is going to be important.

«She's» ‹still like adorably cute›. «Still» speaks to time. Is Melissa saying that Karlie is ‹still› ‹cute›? No. Next, [25.00]she qualifies Karlie's cuteness with ‹like›, which is "similar to". Similar to what? Is Melissa saying that Karlie is ‹still› similar to ‹cute›? No. Melissa again qualifies Karlie's appearance with ‹adorably›. This extreme need to persuade about Karlie's appearance indicates that Karlie's current appearance is markedly different than her picture. This is alarming and unexpected.

Sentence 26

> She doesn't wear makeup and everything.

Melissa offers negation related to Carly «wearing» ‹makeup›. This raises sensitivity again to Karlie's appearance. This comment seems out of place and unnecessary. What is Melissa meaning by ‹everything›? What else does Karlie «not» ‹wear›?

Sentence 27

> She left in her jeans, um, and a t-shirt.

Melissa's use of the word "left" indicates critical missing [26.00]information, which is being deliberately withheld. It also indicates that Melissa's thoughts are stuck back at the moment Karlie ‹left›. She doesn't say, ⸗~~Karlie went for a walk wearing her jeans~~⸗. Her thought process isn't moving forward. It's at the point when Karlie ‹left›.

She also pauses with an ‹um› to slow her thoughts and prevent inadvertent leakage.

Sentences 28, 29

> So, I'm putting *** out there. And just go for it.

Melissa starts her sentence with ‹So›, which is a sensitivity indicator, as it is a need to explain why, without being asked.

She then says, ‹I'm putting›, which is the fourth reference to «putting» a message ‹out there› or ‹on blast› in her message. Repetition indicates sensitivity. Communicating Karlie's missing status has produced extreme sensitivity in her statement.

She skips referencing what she is ‹putting … out there›, which [27.00]indicates the need to psychologically distance herself from her own message. The spot which I've indicated with asterisks could have been filled with ⸗~~this~~⸗, or ⸗~~this message~~⸗, or anything along those lines. She does not want to claim her message or name what she's putting out there.

Her second sentence starts with ‹And›, which ties it to the previous sentence and indicates missing information. She then uses ‹just› when telling her audience to ‹go for it›; ‹just› is used to minimize or reduce. Why does Melissa have the need to minimize, ‹go for it›, to her audience? What is the ‹it› she wants her audience to ‹go for› and then minimize? We'll let her words guide us.

Sentence 30

> Everybody help me out here.

Melissa is asking for ‹help› for herself, not for Karlie. *She* needs ‹help›. This type of language is seen in 911 calls where the caller has guilty knowledge of the crime. Melissa's priority in the message is not [28.00]Karlie being found. It is about Melissa needing help. This is unexpected.

Sentences 31, 32, 33

> I love you all, everybody please watch. Share your friends, share my friends, share everybody's but just share the shit out of it … alright? Thank you.

When Melissa says ‹I love you all›, she is ingratiating herself to her audience again. Please note also that in Melissa's message, she has verbalized love for CHP one time, her audience two times, and Karlie zero times.

Melissa has a strong presence in her first sentence with ‹I love you›. The pronoun "I" indicates she is invested in this sentence. When she moves on in directing her audience, the "I" disappears. She is not saying ≠~~I need you to~~≠ or even ≠~~we need you to share this message~~≠. This indicates that her commitment to these actions is reduced.

She is [29.00]asking for people to ‹please watch›. We don't expect politeness in an urgent message about a missing child. What is expected is "Karlie needs your help to find her," and this is not her message. She wants them to ‹watch›. Earlier in her message, it was ‹okay› for them *not* to ‹watch›. There is incongruence in her words, and this is a strong indication that she is not speaking from experiential memory, but from scripted language.

There is no call to action. Melissa asks her audience to ‹share›: ‹Share your friends, share my friends, share everybody's›. Her audience «sharing» is very sensitive to Melissa as she repeats this four times. She has still not asked for help in regards to Karlie. We expect to see or hear the word ≠~~find~~≠ in the subject statement. We do not. Melissa is asking her audience to ‹watch› and ‹share›.

She then moves into ‹but›, which minimizes or refutes what came before this. Melissa is asking her audience to ‹watch› and ‹share› and then minimizes or refutes [30.00]what she asked them to do.

Then she says ‹just›. «Just» is then used to minimize her audience «sharing» ‹the shit out of it›. Melissa refuted and then minimized what she asked her audience to do indicating she has another motivation for «sharing» this information with her audience.

Melissa Gusé's Facebook Live video from October 13, 2018, was an interesting analysis. If we enter into Melissa's linguistic reality, Karlie is not her stepdaughter. Melissa may have admired Karlie's physical attributes, however, there are no other positives stated about Karlie.

Melissa gives a half-hearted show of concern, with no linguistic empathy about how Karlie is currently doing, given that she may be out in the desert, perhaps even abducted or taken. Melissa is Karlie's stepmother and, as such, not related to Karlie. However, she has been in the role of primary caretaker for the past 8 to 10 years, to which there should be natural maternal denial. [31.00]Melissa's optimism and maternal denial concerning Karlie's status has been overtaken by a premature pessimism, given that this video was made 10 hours after she went missing.

Melissa gives no linguistic cues that indicate hope of reunification. She urges her viewers to ‹watch› and ‹share›, not ≠~~search~~≠ and ≠~~find~~≠. Instead, she uses the highest levels of sensitivity and language, along with weak assertions and a need to persuade that all point to the priority of her message. The need is not to find Karlie, but to justify self.

Melissa requests help for herself, because Karlie is beyond help. Melissa is deceptively withholding critical information regarding Karlie's location and how she left that morning. This, along with the totality of her message, indicates Melissa has knowledge that Karlie is beyond concern.

Melissa Gusé's October 22, 2018 Facebook Live video [32.00]statement is currently being analyzed. We look to see if this will further confirm or deny these findings.